

Application No.: 09/913,688

Docket No.: SONYSU 3.3-135

IN THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 has been amended to comply with the Examiner's objection pursuant to MPEP § 608.02(g).

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheet (1 page).

REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated April 7, 2006. Claims 1, 2, 7, 19, 20, 35 and 37 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Claims 8-18, 25-34, 36 and 38 have been withdrawn from further consideration and claims 3-6 and 21-24 have been canceled. The specification has been amended to include priority information.

The Examiner objected to the title by asserting that it is not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title to be more descriptive. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings. In particular, the Examiner indicated that Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as -- Prior Art -- because only that which is old is illustrated. A replacement drawing sheet for Figure 1 is submitted herewith in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Thus, it is believed that the new Figure 1 addresses the Examiner's objection to the drawings. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 19-24, 35, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2, 7, 19, 20, 35 and 37 have been amended. Claims 3-6 and 21-24 have been canceled. Thus, it is believed that rejections pertaining to indefiniteness have been addressed and thus applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 19, 21, 24, 35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant

Admitted Prior Art (AAPA: pages 1-9 and FIG. 1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an information processing apparatus that includes "transfer preparing means for permitting DMA-transferring and issuing an end status". Support for the amendment may be found, by way of example only, on pages 21 and 23, FIG. 4 (command cell 82 and DMA state machine 86) and FIGS. 8 and 9 (flow chart showing permission and end status) of the instant application. Claim 1 was also amended to recite an "index adding means for adding an updated address on the recording means when said end status is issued" and a transfer means for DMA-transferring said packets "for recording" to the recording "means" in accordance with said command formed in said command buffer "and said updated address from said index adding means." Support for these amendments may be found, by way of example only, on page 15 and Fig. 3 (index adding unit 64) of the instant application. Independent claims 19, 35 and 37 have been amended in a similar manner as in claim 1.

The AAPA fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 19, 35 and 37. By way of example only, AAPA does not disclose a "transfer preparing means" as recited in claims 1, 19, 35 and 37. AAPA does describe a host DMA interface 29 for handling DMA transfers of data. However, AAPA does not teach or suggest a transfer preparing means for permitting DMA-transferring and issuing an end status as recited in claims 1, 19, 35 and 37. In addition, AAPA does not teach or suggest an "index adding means" as recited in claims 1, 19, 35 and 37.

Thus, for at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 19, 35 and 37 are in condition for allowance. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and

contains all of the limitations thereof. Claims 3, 6, 21 and 24 have been canceled and thus the rejections directed to these claims are now moot.

Claims 2, 4-5, 20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Mergard (US. 5,881,248).

Claims 2 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively, and include of the limitations thereof. As stated above, AAPA fails to teach or suggest claims 1 and 19. Mergard does not overcome the deficiencies of AAPA. Moreover, Mergard does not teach or suggest the memory means and DMA-transferring features as recited in claims 2 and 20. Thus, applicants submit that claims 2 and 20 are also in condition for allowance. Claims 4-5 and 22-23 have been canceled and thus the rejections directed to these claims are now moot.

Claims 6 and 24 were alternatively rejected over AAPA in view of Tanikawa (EP 0 275 157 A2). Claims 6 and 24 have been canceled and thus the rejections directed to these claims are now moot.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 09/913,688


Docket No.: SONYSU 3.3-135

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Arthur S. Ortega

Registration No.: 53,422

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

669676_1.DOC